

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/607,896		CAHILL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Beemnet W. Dada		2135	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Beemnet W. Dada. (3)\_\_\_\_\_

(2) Kenneth R. Eiferman. (4)\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 05 March 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1,7,13 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: Peinado (WO 00/59150).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants representative indicated that the art on record fails to teach obtaining a license in an automatic manner. Examiner indicated that obtaining a license in an automatic manner is a matter of design choice and further indicated that Peinado teaches the claim limitations. Applicants representative further proposed an amendment to the claims to include the limitation where email content is placed/retrieved from a queue. Examiner indicated that such an amendment would overcome the art on record.